

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.ustrip.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/007,358	11/05/2001	Jesus Santoyo Ortega	D/A0A47 XER 2 0422	3572	
7590 07/25/2005			EXAMINER		
Mark S. Svat			ZHOU, TING		
FAY, SHARP	E, FAGAN, MINNICH	& McKEE, LLP			
Seventh Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
1100 Superior Avenue			2173.		
Cleveland, OH 44114-2518			DATE MAILED: 07/25/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/007,358	ORTEGA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Ting Zhou	2173

•	Ting Zhou	2173	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 11 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comparing time periods:</li> </ol>	n the same day as filing a Notice wing replies: (1) an amendment, otice of Appeal (with appeal fee)	of Appeal. To avoid al affidavit, or other evid in compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of	the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three monther earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136 nd the corresponding amount of the fe stutory period for reply originally set in t	e. The appropriate extension he final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(	e)), to avoid dismissal	of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a b	ief will not be entered	hecause
<ul><li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co</li><li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li></ul>	nsideration and/or search (see N w);	IOTE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beauting appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially	reducing or simplifying	g the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally	rejected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		•	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-	Compliant Amendmen	t (PTOL-324).
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s</li></ol>	•		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).	·	-	
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		will be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		•	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under ap y and was not earlier presented.	peal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	ails to provide a (1).
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	on of the status of the claims afte	er entry is below or atta	ched. *
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	•	1	ance because:
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Pap	er No(s)	
13.  Other:		JOHN CARECA	
	$C_{SI}$	JOHN CABECA JPERVISORY PATENT I	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 4-05) TECHNOLOGY CENTER 210'

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303): Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Baker does not teach a specific instruction understandable by the person following the instruction irrespective of the written language understood by the person. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated by the examiner in the final office action mailed on 22 February 2005, Baker teaches symbols that can be arranged to execute a command, i.e. an instruction, on page 2, paragraph 0013. Furthermore, as shown in Figures 2 and 5a-5c, the symbols that are used to arrange an instruction are pictures, or images are drawn, instead of being written with a specific language and are therefore language-dependent and can be understood by any person. In view of the above, the examiner respectfully maintains that Baker teaches the subject limitation, and submit that the applicant's arguments have not placed the application in condition for allowance; the claims remain finally rejected according to the rejection mailed on 22 February 2005